

REMARKS

Entry of the foregoing amendments and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 28-54 are pending in the application, with claims 28, 36, 40, 41, 45, 49, and 51 being the independent claims. The Applicants respectfully submit that these amendments introduce no new matter. Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, the Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all outstanding rejections.

Interview Summary

On behalf of the Applicants, the undersigned wishes to express appreciation to Examiner Clow for the courtesies extended during the interview conducted on September 7, 2006. During the interview, Applicants' representatives discussed proposed amendments to the pending claims to address the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112. The Examiner indicated that the proposed claim amendments would overcome the rejections.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Examiner did not consider References 77 and 155 from the information disclosure statement filed on April 7, 2006 because they do not contain publication dates. The Applicants note that Reference 77 cites to a publication dated 1995. The Applicants also note that Reference 155 cites to a publication dated 2001. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner consider References 77 and 155 as prior art for the purposes of this application. The Applicants, however, reserve the right to assert that References 77 and 155 are not prior art with respect to this application in this, or any future, proceeding.

The Claims As Amended Comply With the Enablement Requirement

Claims 28-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. As discussed during the interview, the Applicants have amended the independent claims to more clearly indicate that it is the results of the bioassay process that are being evaluated. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended comply with the enablement requirement.

The Claims As Amended Comply With The Written Description Requirement

Claims 28-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st paragraph as failing to comply with the written description requirement. As discussed during the interview, the claims have been amended to recite a “model centroid.” Support for this amendment can be found, for example, at paragraph [0030]. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims comply with the written description requirement.

The Claims As Amended Are Definite

Claims 28-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. As discussed above, the claims have been amended to recite a “model centroid.” Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as amended are definite.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed or rendered moot. The Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that further personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated: September 13, 2006

Cooley Godward LLP
ATTN: Patent Group
The Bowen Building
875 15th Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20005-2221
Tel: (703) 456-8000
Fax: (202) 842-7899

Respectfully submitted,
COOLEY GODWARD LLP

By:



Timothy D. Ford
Reg. No. 47,567